

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/529,044	01/17/2006	Joo-Ho Kim	0001.1045	1715	
	49455 7590 07/29/2009 STEIN MCEWEN, LLP			EXAMINER	
1400 EYE STREET, NW			BERNATZ, KEVIN M		
SUITE 300 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	-,		1794		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/29/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptomail@smiplaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/529,044	KIM ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kevin M. Bernatz	1794		

The MAN INC DATE of this commitment of the commi	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence	address
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. Q The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other eviden application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the periods:	ice, which places the 31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final ris Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), DNLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W.	ejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL RELECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The telds on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the apprhave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The apprunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final reject may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ropriate extension fee I Office action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on	onths of the date of of the appeal. Since a
AMENDMENTS 3. \(\text{\text{\text{\$\left}}}\) The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entere (a) \(\text{\$\tex	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplify appeal; and/or	ring the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendments	ent (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amen non-allowable claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amen non-allowable claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amen non-allowable claim(s).	
7. \(\times\) for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\times\) will not be entered, or b) \(\times\) will be entered and how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	an explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1 and 5</u> .	
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NOVE</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>3.7.8 and 10.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>NONE</i> .	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal w because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other eviden was not earlier presented. Sea 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a bin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellar showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 4183	nt fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or a REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ttached.
11. \(\times The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for alk See Continuation Sheet.	owance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:	
/Kevin M Berr Primary Evan July 24, 2009	natz/ iner, Art Unit 1794

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the proposed amendments to remove the recitation of AuOx, leaving only TaOx as the mask layer results in new embodiments that would require further search and/or consideration. I.e. previously, either TaOx or AuOx was sufficient to read on the relevant claims.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are directed to the unentered amendment. In so far as they apply to the rejection of record, the Examiner acknowledges that a plurality of references appear to render the claims to SiOx mask layers as obvious. Likewise, the Examiner acknowledges that while Moritani et al. disclose AuOx mask layers. Moritani et al. is silent with regard to TaOx mask layers. However, additional search and/or consideration would be required before any indication of allowability, since the obviousness of a TaOx mask layer (solely) was not previously required.